UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,177	03/10/2004	Surajit Chatterjee	CITI0318	4052

27510 7590 05/02/2007
KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
607 14TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
FATEHI, PARHAM R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/797,177	CHATTERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/10/2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *3/10/2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/31/2005, 6/14/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-30 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 10/31/2005 and 6/14/2004. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12, 15, 17-22, 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare et Al. (US 2005/0015772) [hereafter Saare] in view of Omori et Al. (US 2002/0184405) [hereafter Omori].

As per Claims 1, 17, 21, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **A method for managing workflow for an application, obtaining an application adapter associated with the application** (Par. 51, ln. 12-14, "modules act as an adapter between the underlying applications" and & Par. 2, ln. 1-11, managing services/workflow)

- **Wherein the application adapter specifies a sub-task** (Par. 56, ln. 2-4, adapter specifies a subtask)
- **performing an action associated with the sub-task** (Par. 56, ln. 1-12, performing action associated with sub-task)
- **A system for managing workflow for an application, comprising an application**, (Par. 2, ln. 1-11, managing services/workflow)
- **wherein the action is associated with a sub-task** (Par. 56, ln. 1-12, action is associated with sub-task)

Saare does not explicitly disclose:

- monitoring the application to obtain a state
- if the state is associated with the sub-task
- wherein the application comprises a state
- an application adapter configured to define an action associated with the state
- an application adapter runtime configured to monitor the application and perform the action when the state is encountered

On the other hand, Omori discloses monitoring the application to obtain a state (Par. 124, ln. 1-5, monitor), if the state is associated with the sub-task (Par, 124, ln. 1-3, if the state is associated with the sub-task), wherein the application comprises a state (Par. 133, ln. 1-3), an application adapter configured to define an action associated with the state (Par. 22, ln. 1-4), an application adapter runtime configured to monitor the application and perform the action when the state is encountered (Par. 124, ln. 1-5, monitor). Omori teaches the method and

system of recording and using application states for providing information processing services. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references, wherein the system of application optimization of Saare would incorporate the method of state recording as disclosed by Omori in order to reduce the labor in managing and using applications.

As per Claims 2 and 18, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **Authenticating a user; and retrieving a profile associated with the user, if the user is authenticated, wherein the profile comprises the application adapter** (Par. 59, ln. 17-19, "authenticating a user and retrieving a profile & Par. 40, ln. 1-6, "profile in Identity module 360 which comprises application adapter module 300)
- **an authentication infrastructure configured to authenticate a user and retrieve a profile associated with the user when the user is authenticated, wherein the profile comprises the application adapter** (Par. 59, ln. 17-19, "authenticating a user and retrieving a profile & Par. 40, ln. 1-6, "profile in Identity module 360 which comprises application adapter module 300)

As per Claims 3 and 19, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **the profile is a single sign-on profile** (Par. 59, ln. 17-19, profile is single sign-on).

As per Claim 4, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **generating the application adapter; and associating the application adapter with the profile** (Par. 59, ln. 1-19, application adapter is generated and associated with profile that can be stored)

As per Claim 5, Saare as modified teaches:

- **wherein generating the application adapter comprises: selecting a task** (Par. 31, ln. 10-12, selecting task)
- **specifying the sub-task associated with the task** (see Abstract, ln. 13-15, sub-process of a task & Par. 56, ln. 1-3, sub-function of applications)
- **generating the application adapter using the state associated with the sub-task and the action** (Par. 56, ln. 1-12, application adapter and sub-task)
- **specifying a means for recording the state associated with the sub-task;**
- **recording the state using the means for recording the state** (Omori, Par. 20-Par. 22, recording data that represents the state of service/sub-task)
- **specifying the action to perform when the state associated with the sub-task is encountered** (Omori, Par. 22, ln. 1-4, performing the action asserted with the sub-task) As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claims 6, 7, 28 and 29, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **the application adapter comprises an initialization portion and a script portion, the script portion comprises the action** (Pg. 7, ln. 22-25, discloses module launches application and since initialization portion includes

information about how the app is launched, it is inherent that the adapter/module includes an initialization portion.

As per Claim 8, Saare as modified teaches:

- **the means for recording the associated state comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of auto-state configuration mechanism and manual-state configuration mechanism** (Omori, Fig. 2, #16 & #13 & Par. 91, ln. 1-6, a state recording mechanism is disclosed where it is inherent that recording can be auto or manually configured). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claim 9, Saare as modified teaches:

- **performing the action comprises passing a local parameter to the application** (Omori, Par. 80-81, discloses API usage, where typically, the protocol for parameter passing is to pass a space pointer that points to the information being passed and as such, API usage inherently includes passing a local parameter). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claims 10 & 25, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **the subtask is associated with a task** (col. 56, ln. 1-3, where the sub-function is associated with the service)

As per Claims 11 & 26, Saare explicitly discloses:

- **the task is at least one selected from the group consisting of a pre-login task, a login task, a post-login task, a logout task, and a pre-termination task** (Par. 31, ln. 11-12, tasks are run, & Par. 39, ln. 17-19, login & Par. 40, ln. 1-6, tasks / channels, login and single sign-on, all steps as claimed are disclosed in the method)

As per Claim 12 & 22, Saare as modified teaches:

- **the sub-task comprises at least one selected from the group consisting of a pre-state setting, the action, and a post-state setting** (Omori, Par. 124-Par. 125, monitoring to obtain state is the pre-state, Par. 25, ln. 1-2, executing is the action as claimed & Par. 164, ln. 6-7, post-processing is post-state). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claims 15 & 27, Saare as modified teaches:

- **the action comprises functionality to navigate the user to a particular point in the application, the action is configured to navigate the user to a particular point in the application** (Omori, Par. 22, ln. 1-4, user can get to a point in application). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claim 16, Saare as modified teaches:

- **the application adapter is interpreted using an application adapter runtime** (Omori, Par. 124, ln. 1-5, monitor serves as a application adapter runtime). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

As per Claim 20, Saare explicitly discloses:

a database configured to store the profile (Fig. 2, #120, storage database & Par. 40, ln. 4, single sign-on)

As per Claim 30, Saare as modified teaches:

- **the state comprises at least one application selected from the group consisting of text, window title, parent and child windows, and control Ids** (Omori, Par. 33, ln. 6, process state of app inherently includes application UI such as windows, text, titles, control, etc.). As to the motivation for combining Saare with Omori, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

4. Claim 13, 14, 23 & 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saare as modified by Omori, and further in view of Pace et Al. (US 2003/0101223) [hereafter Pace].

As per Claims 13, 14, 23 & 24 Saare, as modified by Omori, substantially discloses the invention as claimed. However,Saare and Omori fail to explicitly disclose: the sub-task comprises a dynamic variable, the action comprises functionality to use the dynamic variable to navigate the user to a particular point in the application

On the other hand, Pace discloses the sub-task comprises a dynamic variable, the action comprises functionality to use the dynamic variable to navigate the user to a particular point in the application (P. 445, ln. 1-3, dynamic link library inherently includes dynamic variables which can point to a point in the application). Pace teaches a method of dividing network application system into multiple tiers by using dynamic link libraries. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Pace's dynamic link library with the system of application optimization of Saare and method of state recording of Omori, in order to facilitate the development and deployment of various computing resources, a motivation which that can be found in the teachings of Pace itself.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Parham (Paul) R. Fatehi whose telephone number is 571-270-1407. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30AM-5PM EST, off alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571)272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul Fatehi
AU 2194

04/26/07

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER